UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

THIRTY-NINTH YEAR

2556th MEETING: 6 SEPTEMBER 1984

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Page

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2556) 1

Adoption of the agenda 1

The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713) 1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/. . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2556th MEETING

Held in New York on Thursday, 6 September 1984, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Elleck Kufakunesu MASHINGAIDZE (Zimbabwe).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zimbabwe.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2556)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in the Middle East:
   Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713)

The meeting was called to order at 4.15 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in the Middle East:
Letter dated 24 August 1984 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/16713)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2552nd to 2555th meetings*], I invite the representative of Lebanon and the representative of Israel to take places at the Council table; I invite the representatives of Cuba, Democratic Yemen, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kuwait, Qatar, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Fakhoury (Lebanon) and Mr. Levin (Israel) took places at the Council table; Mr. Oramas Oliva (Cuba), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Damavandi Kamali (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr. Al-Kawari (Qatar), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. El-Fattal (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Kirca (Turkey), Mr. Al-Mosfir (United Arab Emirates) and Mr. Noman (Yemen) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

2. The PRESIDENT: Members of the Council have before them document S/16732, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Lebanon.

3. I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of ZIMBABWE.

4. I have already paid a richly deserved tribute to Ambassador Bassole of the Republic of Burkina Faso for the most exemplary manner in which he presided over the business of the Council during August. He certainly acquitted himself as an experienced and accomplished diplomat, which is to the credit of his great country and people.

5. Only some three weeks ago, the Council was requested to consider and pronounce itself on a matter regarding the behaviour of the *apartheid* régime of South Africa, which is continuously and flagrantly violating international law and the most fundamental norms of human decency. Now the Council is seized of another equally grave matter concerning Israel's inhuman practices in southern Lebanon, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district, which Israel continues to occupy illegally, in blatant defiance of the demands of the Lebanese people and of the Council's decisions and resolutions. Many speakers have already observed that it is not coincidental that Israel is intransigent in this matter and that it continues to violate international humanitarian law in ways similar to those characteristic of the *apartheid* South African régime. The Tel Aviv and Pretoria régimes, it has also been pointed out, are birds of a feather.

6. Let me remind members that, on 6 June 1982, the Council unanimously adopted resolution 509 (1982), in which, *inter alia*, it demanded that Israel immediately and unconditionally withdraw its military forces to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon. More than two years, however, have gone by without any sign that Israel intends to comply with that demand. In fact, Tel Aviv has come up with one pre-condition and pretext after another in a vain attempt to justify its continued illegal behaviour. Israel must be reminded in clear language that there is no justification under international law for any act which in any way threatens the territorial integrity, unity, freedom and sovereignty

of another State. The Charter of the United Nations clearly states, in Article 2, paragraph 4, that

> "All Members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."

7. Concern has been expressed, in the Council and elsewhere, that Israel's occupation of one third of the territory of Lebanon in defiance of international opinion may be part of its grand expansionist design. Those who have voiced this concern have cited Israeli occupation of the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Syria's Golan Heights, which have now been annexed in defiance of United Nations demands.

8. As if the military occupation of the territory of the people of southern Lebanon was not a sufficient humiliation and deprivation, the occupying authorities daily commit atrocities against those people. The statement made by the representative of Lebanon to the Council on 29 August last [*2552nd meeting*] is indeed a detailed and well-documented catalogue of Israel's violations of the rights of the Lebanese population in the occupied parts of Lebanon.

9. The intervention of the representative of Israel [*ibid.*], on the other hand, reads very much like a classical example of the arrogance of the phenomenon of military aggression and occupation. The representative of Israel not only chose to ignore, as of no consequence, the charges of the violation of the humanitarian principles of the Regulations annexed to The Hague Convention IV respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land of 1907[1] and the Geneva Conventions of 1949,[2] but also arrogated to himself and to his country the right to tell the Government and people of Lebanon how they should conduct their affairs in the northern part of the country.

10. Israel's current practices in southern Lebanon, and that régime's continued military occupation of that territory in defiance of resolutions adopted by the Council, constitute a systematic violation of the territorial integrity of Lebanon and they threaten its freedom and political sovereignty. The Council must be gravely concerned about this situation, and should therefore demand Israel's immediate compliance with resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982).

11. On 29 August, the representative of Israel adduced Israel's security interests and concerns as justification for the continued illegal military occupation of a third of Lebanon's land. We have already rejected this, however, and we should like to point out that peace and security for all in that volatile region can never be achieved by pursuing policies which are aggressive, militaristic and expansionist, nor by avoiding the real root cause of tension and conflict in that region. There can never be peace and security for any country in the Middle East, in our view, as long as the inalienable rights to self-determination, independence and sovereignty are denied to the Palestinian people. Any efforts to bring peace and security to that region which evade or in any way gloss over this very important issue will not succeed.

12. We believe that the essential elements of a just and lasting Middle East settlement, with prospects for peace and security for all the peoples of the region, must include, among other things, complete Israeli withdrawal from all the occupied Arab and Palestinian lands, followed by the restitution of Arab sovereignty in these territories and the establishment of an independent and sovereign State of Palestine in Palestine. We are afraid that the road which Israel is following, with regard both to southern Lebanon and to the rest of the region, can only complicate further the already dangerous situation and risk an even bloodier bloody conflict, the effects of which may be impossible to confine to that region. It is therefore the duty and responsibility of the Council, in accordance with the Charter, to take all possible steps to avert such a prospect. Regarding Lebanon's complaint about current Isareli practices in its territory, the Council should insist on the utmost respect of Lebanon's legitimate right of territorial integrity and political sovereignty, as demanded by resolutions 508 (1982) and 509 (1982) and in accordance with the Charter.

13. I now resume my functions as PRESIDENT.

14. Mr. BORG (Malta): At this point of the debate on the question submitted to the Council by the representative of Lebanon, I should like to direct my statement to a point of procedure.

15. I should like first, however, to extend to you, Sir, the congratulations of the delegation of Malta on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. We have already experienced the benefits of your well-known diplomatic skills and abilities, which do honour to you and to your country, Zimbabwe. We are therefore sure that with your leadership the work of the Council is in safe and able hands.

16. Allow me also to take this opportunity to pay a tribute to your predecessor, Mr. Bassole, the representative of Burkina Faso, for the dedicated and fine manner in which he guided the work of the Council during the month of August.

17. In accordance with rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure, which states, in particular, that "proposals and draft resolutions may be put to a vote only at the request of a representative on the Security Council", the delegation of Malta would like formally to request that the draft resolution submitted by Lebanon [*S/16732*] be put to a vote.

18. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the provisions of rule 38 of the provisional rules of procedure,

the representative of Malta has requested that the draft resolution submitted by Lebanon be put to a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

19. I shall first call on those members of the Council that wish to make statements before the voting.

20. Mr. ARIAS STELLA (Peru) [*interpretation from Spanish*]: I should like to extend my delegation's cordial greetings and congratulations to you, Sir, in these early days of your term as President of the Council for September. We are well aware of your abilities and experience and we are quite sure that our work will be given wise guidance during this month.

21. We take great pleasure also in expressing our gratitude to the representative of Burkina Faso, who has just completed a month of hard work as President of the Council—a month during which he showed brilliance; his sense of balance and his abilities were appreciated by all of us.

22. The Council is now meeting again to consider the situation in Lebanon—this time because of the implications of the practices and measures of the Israeli authorities in the southern part of the country. According to information made available by the Lebanese Government, these practices and measures are a flagrant breach of the human rights of the inhabitants of the region and constantly jeopardize their development and well-being.

23. The invasion of the territory of Lebanon in 1982 clearly lies at the origin of this situation, as does the occupation to which it led. Both the invasion and the occupation have been repeatedly rejected by the Council and the entire international community.

24. Since then, notwithstanding the unanimous demands for the withdrawal of the occupation forces, Lebanon has proved unable to recover its legitimate rights to sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity.

25. The conduct of the occupation forces, besides being in violation of the Charter of the United Nations, breaches many international legal instruments, including the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[1] and The Hague Conventions II of 1899 and IV of 1907 respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land.[1]

26. Consequently, with regard to the facts the Council has taken note of at earlier meetings, my country's position is as follows. First, once again we demand the immediate restoration of the right of the Lebanese people and Government to independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity and full exercise of their authority throughout the territory within the frontiers universally recognized as being theirs. It is clear that in order to achieve this legitimate objective, and generally in order to produce true opportunities for the stabilization and pacification of Lebanon, it is essential that all foreign presence in the territory be removed. Secondly, and consequently, we reaffirm our support for strict compliance with the provisions of the relevant Council resolutions, particularly 508 (1982) and 509 (1982). Thirdly, the occupation authorities and forces must comply with their duties and responsibilities under international law and consequently put an immediate end to the measures and practices that are so detrimental to the Lebanese people through which they seek to usurp the patrimony of that people.

27. It is plain to my delegation that the sufferings of the Lebanese people are but one link in the long chain of sufferings of the peoples of the Middle East. These lengthy sufferings include those unjustly visited upon the Palestinian people. Clearly, the Middle East problem is very complex and has many facets requiring appropriate political solutions and a genuine desire for compromise on the part of the parties involved. This long-awaited process can be viable only to the extent that the Governments of the region refrain from carrying out acts or adopting attitudes that will aggravate their differences and jeopardize the prospects for a comprehensive and lasting peace.

28. For those reasons my delegation will vote in favour of the draft resolution. Peru would have preferred a more balanced text, however, including mention of other occupying forces, which must also comply with the terms of the fourth Geneva Convention.

29. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): I have to admit that my return to New York at the very end of August was not solely in order to have the pleasure of sitting under your presidency in the Council, Sir, but it is with pleasure that I see you presiding. Your country and mine have very special links, and you have made a notable place for yourself in this body.

30. I do not regret having been on leave, but I am sorry to have missed the presidency of Ambassador Bassole of Burkina Faso. The fame of his achievements last month has been reported to me, and my delegation is very grateful for all he did for the Council during his presidency.

31. My delegation listened with great sympathy to the representative of Lebanon as he described to the Council yet a further chapter in the human tragedy which still afflicts his country. The plight of the long-suffering Lebanese people is a matter of continuing concern to my Government. It is indeed a matter of continuing concern to us all.

32. Throughout Lebanon's crisis my Government has consistently spoken out in support of the restoration of Lebanese sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity. These principles were reiterated in the declaration on Lebanon adopted by the Ministers for

Foreign Affairs of the 10 States members of the European Economic Community on 27 March this year [*see S/16456, annex*], and have been repeatedly supported by the Council. We must continue to do all we can to give effect to them.

33. External factors are crucial to the return of Lebanon to its former stability and prosperity. The Lebanese will not be able to regain their sovereignty and independence while the greater part of Lebanon remains under the occupation of foreign forces. The United Kingdom, like its partners in the Ten, has consistently called for the early withdrawal of all such forces. Indeed, the withdrawal of forces ought to proceed hand in hand with national reconciliation.

34. It is now more than two years since Israel's invasion of Lebanon in June 1982. That attempt by Israel to impose its will by force was profoundly mistaken and rightly condemned by the international community. We are now faced with its sad consequences.

35. Israel's continued occupation of the area is wrong and is leading to hardship and a worsening cycle of violence. The situation has become bitter for both occupier and occupied.

36. The solution is clear. The Israeli Government should now withdraw its forces. There is an urgent need for early talks on the subject, through intermediaries if necessary. These talks must recognize, however, that Israel has legitimate security needs. My Government naturally supports the principle of security arrangements which ensure safety for citizens on both sides of the border. Peace on that border is clearly in the interests of all concerned, the inhabitants of Israel and Lebanon alike, and indeed of the international community as a whole. It is a principal object of my Government to bring about that situation.

37. In the meantime, it is imperative that the Israeli occupying forces should scrupulously respect the international conventions on humanitarian law applicable to armed conflicts. In particular Israel should respect all the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.[3] My Government recognizes that Israel, as the occupying Power, may find it necessary to institute security precautions. But these must be designed to have the minimum effect on the lives of the local inhabitants, and must not conflict with Israel's obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention.

38. It should be the objective of the Council to help promote a solution to the problem of southern Lebanon. It cannot do so by rhetoric. The key to a solution lies in constructive diplomacy, pursued actively but quietly. Both the Secretary-General and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) have a potentially important role to play in this. My Government believes that through painstaking diplomacy the necessary agreements can be achieved. UNIFIL should be given a wider and more useful role in helping the Lebanese Government to maintain security in southern Lebanon. This will be particularly needed as Israeli withdrawal takes place, in order to provide added protection for the Lebanese and Palestinian civilians who may be at risk.

39. We hope that after this debate is over all concerned will seek, swiftly and without recrimination, to advance the course of diplomacy. My Government believes that, in the absence of general support for the draft resolution, it would have been better not to have pressed it to a vote. However, since a vote has been called and since certain helpful changes have been made to the draft, my Government will vote in favour. We do so to register the importance which we attach to the scrupulous observance of the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention in the occupied areas of southern Lebanon. In the discussions and negotiations which have led to the present draft we have consistently sought to promote attitudes of mutual understanding, to avoid extremes and to encourage the solution of difficult problems through a process of accommodating all the interests legitimately involved.

40. Mr. van der STOEL (Netherlands): First of all, I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September. Your diplomatic skills and experience are well known to all of us.

41. Also, I want to pay tribute to the representative of Burkina Faso, Mr. Bassole, for the exemplary way in which he presided over the Council during the month of August.

42. The Council has been convened to consider the situation in the southern part of Lebanon that is at present occupied by the Israel Defence Forces. During the debate the representative of Lebanon conveyed to us the deep concern of his Government at the general deterioration of the situation in the area under Israeli occupation. In particular, he drew our attention to the recent restrictive measures by the Israeli military authorities, such as the closing of roads and crossings, the limitation of freedom of movement of individuals and the normal flow of persons and goods between the occupied areas and the rest of Lebanon, and the obstructions placed in the way of Lebanese government institutions and personnel.

43. My Government shares those humanitarian concerns of the Lebanese Government. We deplore the situation that has been created in southern Lebanon owing to the prolonged Israeli military occupation of that area in contravention of the relevant resolutions of the Council. Israel is in duty bound to respect and uphold all the provisions of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[3] as well as of other norms of international law, such as the obligations arising from the Regulations annexed to The Hague Convention IV

of 1907 respecting the Laws and Customs of War on Land.[1] My delegation therefore agrees with the relevant paragraphs in the draft resolution now under consideration which affirm the applicability of the aforementioned international conventions and call upon Israel strictly to respect the rights of the civilian population in the areas under its occupation in southern Lebanon.

44. At the same time, my delegation also harbours some considerable hesitations about the draft resolution as presented to us by the Lebanese delegation. The situation in southern Lebanon is, no doubt, serious and deserves our attention. Is it proper, however, for the Council to single out the humanitarian situation in southern Lebanon only, without regard for other aspects of the crisis in Lebanon which need to be addressed urgently as well?

45. My delegation has stated on many occasions that we fully support the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty and independence of Lebanon, and it is clear that the foregoing requires the withdrawal of all unauthorized foreign forces from Lebanese territory.

46. Moreover, although we fully sympathize with the humanitarian intentions of the draft resolution, let us not forget that our main objective should be to facilitate the early and complete withdrawal of the Israel Defence Forces from Lebanese territory which is already long overdue. The Netherlands has always been committed to that objective, which is a necessary condition for the restoration of genuine peace and normality in southern Lebanon. One of the major reasons why the Netherlands has kept a limited contingent in UNFIL is because we still hope that the Force will play an important role in achieving the objectives of an Israeli withdrawal and of the restoration of peace and normality, as well as the re-establishment of the authority and sovereignty of the Lebanese Government in southern Lebanon.

47. The Secretary-General recently put forward some useful ideas to attain these goals with which all parties concerned would seem to have concurred. The Secretary-General also suggested that the Council consider at the appropriate time a future course of action which would make more effective UNIFIL's mandate in southern Lebanon in the context of an Israeli withdrawal from that area. Whether such an opportunity will indeed present itself to the Council in due course we will probably know only after the formation of a new Government in Israel, where elections were held recently. In the meantime, the Council should, in our opinion, avoid any actions that might prove to be counter-productive.

48. In conclusion, it is with those reservations in mind that my Government will nevertheless cast an affirmative vote on the draft resolution. The humanitarian intentions of that draft resolution have our full sympathy.

49. The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/16732.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Burkina Faso, China, Egypt, France, India, Malta, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Peru, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Zimbabwe.

Against: United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

The result of the vote was 14 in favour and 1 against.

The draft resolution was not adopted, the negative vote being that of a permanent member of the Council.

50. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): We wish to extend to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council and also to express our sincere appreciation to the representative of Burkina Faso for the extremely skilful way in which he led the Council last month.

51. No one can remain unmoved by the plight of the people of Lebanon. The people of the United States know of their suffering. We have shared in it. No one wishes more for an end to the violence and suffering that continues throughout Lebanon and for the restoration of a normal, peaceful condition in that country. Unfortunately, the draft resolution we had before us today would not have advanced that goal.

52. We are, of course, aware of the particular problems endured by the people of southern Lebanon over the past decade which led to the invasion of the Israeli forces and occupation in 1982. As the occupying military Power in southern Lebanon, Israel clearly has both special rights and duties as prescribed by the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949,[2] and the Regulations annexed to The Hague Convention IV of 1907.[1] In his statement [*2552nd meeting*] the representative of Israel said that Israel's conduct in southern Lebanon met the requirements of the fourth Geneva Convention and that the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) was aware of the fact that Israel had been applying that Convention in areas of Lebanon under its control.

53. Lebanon desperately wants and needs an end to the hostilities throughout Lebanon and peace in which to heal its wounds. We support efforts which will achieve these goals. My Government strongly supports full respect for the sovereignty, independence, unity and territorial integrity of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries. My Government has worked hard to help achieve these objectives. Sadly, they remain to be achieved and they are hardly addressed in today's draft resolution.

54. For example, an essential element in achieving these goals is the evacuation from Lebanon of all for-

eign forces. Yet the draft resolution made no specific mention of all foreign forces or of the discord in Lebanon other than that in southern Lebanon.

55. We have heard repeatedly from many speakers in this debate that the principle subject of the draft resolution, however, is the continued Israeli military presence in southern Lebanon. Yet Israel has repeatedly expressed its willingness and desire to leave southern Lebanon. The representative of Israel repeated to the Council that his Government is prepared to enter into direct negotiations on security questions with the Government of Lebanon. Further, the draft resolution was silent about humanitarian concerns for the suffering of those elsewhere in Lebanon. In terms of practical help for humanitarian concerns in the south or elsewhere in Lebanon, there was no mention in the draft resolution, or in fact in most of the statements before the Council, of the appropriate role available for international organizations, such as ICRC.

56. We believe it is unreasonable and unrealistic for the Council to address the question of foreign forces in southern Lebanon and humanitarian and security problems there without dealing with these same problems in all of Lebanon. When the Council is prepared to look at the security and humanitarian problems throughout Lebanon, we will join in that effort. But we cannot be a party to an unbalanced draft resolution which takes a selective, myopic look at only one part of the problem.

57. For those reasons my Government voted against the draft resolution.

58. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) [*interpretation from Russian*]: Since the Soviet delegation is speaking this month for the first time in the Council, allow me sincerely to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the lofty post of President of the Council. We are familiar with your great diplomatic experience and we are sure that the conduct of the Council is in reliable hands.

59. I should like to take this opportunity to thank the representative of Burkina Faso, your predecessor in the post of President of the Council last month, for the highly qualified conduct of the Council's work.

60. In our last statement made in the Council, the Soviet delegation had an opportunity to show that the policy of the United States in the Middle East was fundamentally anti-Arab. Today's vote by the United States in the Council has reaffirmed that well-known truth that the policy of the United States in the Council is also an anti-Arab policy in essence.

61. Over the last three and a half years, the United States has eight times used the veto in the Council against the vital interests of Arab countries and peoples: the veto against the Syrian Arab Republic, the veto against the Palestinians and the veto against Lebanon.

62. In January 1982 [*2329th meeting*], the United States vetoed the draft resolution envisaging consideration by the Council of specific measures to rescind the annexation by Israel of the Syrian Golan Heights. The United States voted then in order to perpetuate that annexation of Syrian lands.

63. In April 1982 twice [*2348th and 2357th meetings*], and in August 1983 [*2461st meeting*] the United States blocked the adoption by the Council of measures against Israeli atrocities in the occupied Arab territories. Thus the United States three times voted for the continuation of the presence of Israel in these territories.

64. Twice in June 1982 [*2379th and 2381st meetings*], and again in 1982 [*2391st meeting*], the United States vetoed three draft resolutions which sought an end to Israel's aggression against Lebanon and the withdrawal of Israeli troops from Lebanon. Today's veto by the United States against Lebanon gives the go-ahead for the continuation by the Israeli occupying forces of outrages in a third of the territory of Lebanon. This is the record of the United States in the Council—a 100-per-cent anti-Arab record. Eight vetoes by the United States are simply eight nails in the coffin of the false claims by the United States to a so-called objective position in the Middle East.

65. The PRESIDENT: I now call on representatives who asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

66. Sir John THOMSON (United Kingdom): May I recall the last sentence of my explanation of vote, which I think is relevant to the explanation of vote that we have just heard from the Soviet Union—or was it the beginning of a new debate? The last sentence of my explanation of vote read as follows:

> "In the discussions and negotiations which have led to the present draft we have consistently sought to promote attitudes of mutual understanding, to avoid extremes and to encourage the solution of difficult problems through a process of accommodating all the interests legitimately involved." [*Para. 39, above.*]

That is the attitude of my Government. I believe that is the attitude of the great majority of delegations represented around the Council table. That palpably is not the attitude of the Soviet Union, and my Government regrets that.

67. It is strange that the delegation which has cast by far the largest number of vetoes in the young history of the Organization should now be casting stones at another delegation. It ill becomes it. It is strange that a delegation which calls so vehemently for the withdrawal of forces from southern Lebanon has failed to heed the call of the General Assembly and the Security Council for the withdrawal of forces from Afghanistan. I believed we had finished our debate. I hoped we had done it, as I had tried to do, on a note of co-operation in

future. I regret the statement of the representative of the Soviet Union.

68. Mr. OVINNIKOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) [*interpretation from Russian*]: The statement made today by the representative of the United Kingdom confirms the view stated by the Soviet delegation at the last meeting that the United Kingdom acts as a junior partner of the United States. I hope the interpreters will render this notion clearly, because last time it was rendered as "younger brother" instead of "junior partner". I hope the representative of the United Kingdom will not deny that in the United States–United Kingdom partnership the United Kingdom is a junior partner. This is truly so, because the United Kingdom is very ready to turn its own side to face the blows in order to spare the flanks of its senior partner.

69. In my statement there was not a word about the position of the United Kingdom. Therefore, I was surprised when the representative of the United Kingdom singled out my delegation and made it the subject of his statement. It would have been more logical if he had said something about the country which, in total isolation, has used the veto against a quite minimal draft resolution proposed by Lebanon. But clearly the representative of the United Kingdom has his own distorted perception of reality.

70. I shall not respond to the attacks of the representative of the United Kingdom against my country, on the understanding that this is my last warning to him.

71. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked to speak, and I now call on him.

72. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): Allow me to return to the subject we are discussing, Mr. President. But let me first congratulate you on your accession to the presidency of the Council and say that I am certain that your rich experience and knowledge will help guide the Council's work.

73. I should also like to express our appreciation of the exemplary manner in which Ambassador Bassole of Burkina Faso discharged his duties during the month of August.

74. The vote that was taken just a few minutes ago appears to have been the second time a vote has been taken during the debate on Lebanon requested by the Permanent Representative of that country and prompted largely by internal constraints. The first vote took place at the very start of deliberations. It was a decision taken by some members of the Council, but it did not go by a show of hands. The decision was to treat Lebanon as if the majority of its burdens—its lack of independence, its civil war, its subjugation by Syria—were all irrelevant to the south and somehow outside the pale. The decision was to ignore the north and the east and the centre. It was decided to heap abuse on Israel because apparently Israel has succeeded in keeping the south free of the bloody turmoil and upheavals plaguing the rest of the country.

75. Syria, the tormentor of Lebanon over this past decade, was absolved of any mention by the Arabs and many of the other speakers. As a consequence of all that, the irrelevance of this debate to the situation in Lebanon as a whole is a fact. The south, after all, is an integral part of the whole of Lebanon.

76. Israel's position on the question of the south has been made abundantly clear by my delegation. Everyone here knows why we were compelled to go in and destroy the terroris state-within-the-State that menaced our lives from just across the border—the PLO [*Palestine Liberation Organization*] state-within-the-State. The countries represented around this table would not have done less; some have done a great deal more. But whereas Israel and Lebanon came to an agreement on 17 May 1983 to provide for the withdrawal of Israel's forces from the south, no parallel agreement has been drawn up or indeed contemplated with Syria. Syria has, on the contrary, made every effort to perpetuate its stranglehold over Lebanon and forced that country to relinquish its hope of establishing good-neighbourly relations with Israel, a development that Syria interprets as contrary to its selfish interests.

77. We have pointed out the glaring differences between the degree of security prevailing in the south and the situation to the north of the Awali River. In the month of August, for instance, not one Lebanese citizen was killed in the south, but according to Lebanese police sources some 215 were killed elsewhere in Lebanon, half of this number in Tripoli. More are being killed there every day.

78. Sadly, but predictably, the results of today's meeting and vote will not change anything in Lebanon. This the Lebanese knew well enough. The Karame Government sought to obtain a propaganda victory to patch up its public image. The Lebanese public will know better.

79. The allegations brought here against Israel can be characterized by the patent nonsense about the waters of the Litani and the Wazzani. In fact, recent objective evidence, as for instance a United observers' report on their visit to the site of the Wazzani, was studiously ignored by the Lebanese delegation and those who took up this strident falsehood. One of the speakers here charged that Israel had claimed to have made southern Lebanon into a paradise—a ridiculous statement, never made by my country. Nevertheless, it will not be denied that tens of thousands of displaced Lebanese have returned to their villages in the south, abandoned during the PLO terrorist misrule. Since we are in the south, however, temporarily and largely as a result of the Syrian-inspired abrogation of the 17 May 1983 Agreement, we shall not and cannot sit idly by and see the security of that area reduced to the hellish conditions prevailing under Syrian control. The gross abuse of

Lebanon's sovereignty and of human rights under Syrian domination, in the present as in the past, are common knowledge everywhere save in the deliberations of the Council. Tel-el-Za'atar, Zahle and Tripoli stand out among others. But no investigation was requested here into the depredations of the Syrian Army in Lebanon, the Army which the Arabs still call a "deterrent force"—to deter the Lebanese from regaining their independence, no doubt.

80. This has been a contrived, counter-productive and unnecessary exercise. The main problems of Lebanon were not even touched upon and have been left where they were. The fires still burn in Tripoli, in Beirut and its environs; car bombs are still being set off and large numbers of people killed as the Council concludes another series of meetings divorced from the realities of life outside.

81. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Lebanon has asked to speak and I call on him.

82. Mr. FAKHOURY (Lebanon) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Sir, please accept the sincere congratulations of the delegation of Lebanon on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for September. You have clearly shown your skill, wisdom and experience in expediting the Council's work and in directing its consultations. You have exerted your good offices on many occasions in order to allow the Council to fulfil its tasks.

83. I also wish to express our thanks to Mr. Bassole, the representative of Burkina Faso, for his continued efforts and for the wisdom and skill he showed during his presidency of the Council in August.

84. Following the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Lebanon, I cannot but thank the members who voted in favour of it for responding to the human tragedy which is being experienced daily by 800,000 Lebanese citizens in the south, the western Bekaa and the Rashaya district and to the suffering caused by Israel's occupation and inhuman practices. I further thank them for having taken a clear stand on those practices and the need to put an end to them forthwith.

85. Lebanon, which came to the Council with a purely humanitarian issue, deeply regrets the opposition of a friendly super-Power, the United States, to a draft resolution limited purely to humanitarian aspects. Until the very last moment the Lebanese delegation had hoped for a unanimous, positive response to the Lebanese demands to be enshrined in a resolution adopted by the Council so that Israel would not feel itself freed from its international commitments and so that the continued helplessness of the Council could not become an incentive for Israel's practices in contravention of the Articles of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international conventions and, more particularly, the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949.

86. Whatever has been said here to belittle the scope of the humanitarian tragedy or to distract attention from it, or to deny the existence of such practices by Israel or to justify them, has been countered by the painful reality which I presented to the Council in my statement on Wednesday, 29 August [*2552nd meeting*]. May I refer members of the Council to articles published in the press, more particularly to one published by *The New York Times* on 2 September and written by its correspondent in Jezzin, in the occupied south. I refer members to this article so that they themselves may check the accuracy of the information we have provided and make their own judgements on the credibility of the claims of the representative of Israel.

87. May the representative of Israel allow me to speak on behalf of Lebanon and for Lebanon. He does not have the right—nor does anyone else—to speak for me.

88. The events that have taken place from time to time in some parts of Lebanon are the inescapable consequences of a 10-year-long crisis. It is neither correct nor fair to compare what is taking place there with what is taking place on territory occupied by Israeli forces. Neither is it fair to use this as an excuse not do deal with the tragedy and its root causes.

89. The Lebanese Government of National Unity is working seriously and with determination to spread the sovereignty of the State to all the territory of Lebanon. Unanimous adoption by the Council of the Lebanese draft resolution would have put an end to the tragedy by putting an end to arbitrary Israeli practices. It would also have helped to support the Lebanese Government and to assist it in its efforts aimed at the ultimate liberation of the land and its unification under one legitimate authority and one national sovereignty.

90. On 15 March last, the Lebanese cabinet adopted a resolution in which it accepted security arrangements with Israel in order to ensure complete Israeli withdrawal from Lebanese territory. Since that time Lebanese officials have reiterated that it is that decision which must be stressed. I say this so that no one will think that it is Israel alone that wishes peace.

91. In conclusion, I wish again to express our deepest regret that again today the Council was unable to respond to our rightful demands and to do its duty regarding Lebanon, a Founding Member of the United Nations. Lebanon, which believes in the principles of the Organization, is committed to the Charter and respects the resolutions and decisions adopted by its organs.

92. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic has asked to make a statement in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

93. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: Allow me at the outset to convey to you, Sir, our sincere congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic has on many occasions expressed its appreciation to you, to your Government and to your people, which has waged a valiant struggle for freedom and independence and against colonialism and hegemony.

94. I wish also to take this opportunity, Sir, to express to your predecessor, the representative of Burkina Faso, our sincere thanks for the efforts he undertook at a time when the Council was adopting an extremely important resolution.

95. The previous statement, by my brother the representative of Lebanon, has almost made it unnecessary for me to speak in response to the blatant lies spoken in the Council, as is his custom, by the representative of international zionism. He spreads his lies near and far, as if to throw sand in the eyes of representatives, in an attempt to distract attention from what is actually taking place in the occupied Arab territories of Palestine, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon.

96. I wish to express my deepest regret that, owing to the United States veto, the Council has not been able to shoulder its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations. But, in fact, a decision was taken in the Council: it was a condemnation by the United States of the United States. I think that no State in the world could cast a vote against the 1949 Geneva Conventions,[2] particularly the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[3]—no State but the United States. What is strange is that the United States knows full well that the 1949 Geneva Conventions were drafted in order to prevent practices which are very similar to the practices of nazism. By having voted against the draft resolution which was before the Council today, the United States has said to Israel, "Yes, stay in southern Lebanon; destroy southern Lebanon; escalate your operations against civilians; separate the south from the north; but do not take any account of the representative of Lebanon when he comes to the Council and says,

> "Once again Lebanon has had recourse to the Council, which remains the haven of small countries that believe in the principles of the United Nations. Lebanon has always been devoted to the principles and the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and has always respected the decisions of its organs." [*2552nd meeting, para. 10.*]

That Lebanese appeal went on:

> "That is why we are lodging a complaint with regard to the practices of the Israeli authorities in our country, and we hope that all the members of the Council will fully understand . . . this tragedy" [*ibid., para. 11*].

97. When the representative of Lebanon said, "all the members of the Council", I understood at whom his remark was aimed; I understood what he meant: there was a general feeling that a United States veto was looming. As has been pointed out by the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, this is the eighth in a series of United States vetoes.

98. Lebanon lodged a complaint with the Council about what has been taking place in its country at the hands of the Israeli authorities. It appealed to the Council and expressed the hope that all the members of the Council would fully understand the depth of the tragedy and take the necessary measures.

99. The United States has clearly contravened here the Charter. The United States has not lived up to its responsibilities to a State a part of whose territory is occupied. I do not believe that this stand will serve the cause of peace in our region. On the contrary, it will lead to an escalation of terrorist activities by Zionist Israel in southern Lebanon. There will be more arbitrary measures, more repression, more killing, more theft of water and more of the many other practices that have been clearly described in the documented statement by the representative of Lebanon to the Council.

100. I really cannot see any explanation for the negative vote cast by the United States on the draft resolution. How can one explain the failure by the United States to live up to its responsibilities in connection with a purely humanitarian issue? It is said that there are American elections in the offing. Yes, indeed, there are American elections. But are the American elections in contradiction with the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention? Is Lebanon to be deprived of the rights enshrined in the fourth Geneva Convention because there are to be American elections? Moreover, the candidates for the presidency of the United States agree that Israel's hegemony over the region should be extended. So what is the United States delegation afraid of?

101. We have been told that this question was presented at a difficult time because of the American elections. But are we the Arabs in Lebanon, Palestine and Syria to pay the price every four years for contradictory American interests? Are we to pay the price because there are American elections? Why should we pay the price for the so-called democracy practiced every four years in the American elections? In any case we regard them as a farce, so evident from what we see every day on the television screens.

102. Of what has Lebanon been deprived? It has been deprived of the support of the international community and the protection of the fourth Geneva Convention by the action of a permanent member of the Council. That is what the United States has done today. By its opposition to the draft resolution, which is completely in accordance with the fourth Geneva Convention—a Convention that is applicable to all of occu-

pied Lebanon's territory—the United States has said to Israel: do exactly what you wish in southern Lebanon. Of course, the agent of the United States in the region is Israel. Israel has become a burden to the American taxpayer; it is obvious that the representative of the United States is not listening to what the American people are saying about what Israel is costing the United States.

103. The Zionist representative says that the Council met in order to divert attention from the events taking place in Lebanon to the occupied southern part of the country. We all know that the Syrian presence in Lebanon was based on a legitimate Lebanese request. That situation has not changed. We have helped Lebanon and we shall continue to help Lebanon because of our traditional, historic relations with it. We have a joint determination to throw out the invaders and to end the Israeli occupation of the southern part of Lebanon as soon as possible.

104. The vote by the United States in the Council, on the other hand, amounts to permission to Israel to remain in southern Lebanon, to continue occupying it, to continue engaging in the practices to which we have now become accustomed. These practices are engaged in every day against the people of Palestine, against the inhabitants of the Syrian occupied territory, the Golan Heights, and against the inhabitants of the occupied southern part of Lebanon.

105. It is not only the pretext of American elections that is cited: we are told also that there are elections in Israel—as though we are supposed to wait for the results of the Israeli elections before the inhabitants of southern Lebanon can get rid of Israeli control. But all that is a lie. The Israeli elections have no connection whatsoever with the work of the Council. The Israeli elections are an internal struggle of the Zionist movement between those in power and those out of power. Zionism is one; the Zionist movement is one. It had 16 parties; I think it now has 24. But they are all Zionists. They all believe in Judaization. They all believe in the acquisition of territory and in ejecting the original inhabitants. Therefore, it would indeed be strange to expect the Israeli elections to liberate Lebanon, to liberate Palestine, to liberate the Golan Heights. Only a simple-minded person could believe that such a thing could happen.

106. We believe that the United States veto will convince the Arab peoples, wherever they may be, to trust sincerely in their own forces to end the Israeli occupation of Palestine, the Golan Heights and southern Lebanon. We shall not be able to regain our rights so long as the United States displays such clear hostility. No delegation in the whole world other than the United States delegation would vote against the fourth Geneva Convention.

107. The PRESIDENT: The representative of Israel has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I now call on him.

108. Mr. LEVIN (Israel): The representative of the subjugators of Lebanon—I refer to Syria—said a few words about the position of his Government, about its policy on Lebanon. Allow me, for his edification, to read out a short excerpt from the Monday morning interview with no less an authority on the subject than the former representative of Lebanon, Ghassan Tuéni. He said the following:

> "Syria's regional role does not really coincide with Lebanon's view of Syrian-Lebanese relations. Now, to be realistic, we all know that Syria exercises tremendous, incredible influence in Lebanon. But that this be considered a fact and that this fact be legitimized are two different proposals. Lebanon's independence is not compatible with the legitimization of such Syrian interests in Lebanon. Furthermore, to admit that Syria could play the role of the protector of the Muslims or their representatives, or that the Muslims should be able to have recourse to Syria in order to enjoy a greater share of power, may be an element of disruption of the Lebanese national unity. Syria has often taken Lebanon as a hostage in its struggle with the West and with Israel, of course. Syria will continue to try to see to it that it has the ability to intervene, to limit our freedom of decision and action, and we will continue to try to see to it that Syria's ability to intervene is limited."

I think that this needs no further comment.

109. The PRESIDENT: The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

110. Mr. EL-FATTAL (Syrian Arab Republic) [*interpretation from Arabic*]: I am not speaking to respond to the representative of the Zionist enemy that is occupying Palestinian, Syrian and Lebanese territories.

111. Mr. President, the occupier always has a pretext, and I think your experience with South Africa is quite sufficient to make that clear. There is a similarity, if not complete identity, given the sacred alliance between Tel Aviv and Pretoria.

112. I have not come here to exchange words with the representative of Israel. I have come here to say one thing, and that is that the United States has prevented the Council from adopting a draft resolution that merely stresses the fourth Geneva Convention and has thus failed to live up to its responsibilities *vis-à-vis* fraternal Lebanon. Therefore there is no need for an exchange of words between us and the Zionists here in the Council.

113. We cannot expect our enemies to behave appropriately. Those enemies know full well the aspirations of the Arab nations and their feelings regarding their acts against Palestine, against Lebanon, against Syria.

114. I believe it to be truly regrettable that the representative of zionism should here quote the words of a previous Ambassador to the United Nations. It is truly regrettable that he does not quote the words of the present representative of Lebanon here in the Council. This is clear proof of the moral values of the so-called State of Israel.

115. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is Mr. Clovis Maksoud, Permanent Observer for the League of Arab States, to whom, at its 2552nd meeting, the Council extended an invitation under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

116. Mr. MAKSOUD: I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council, which is a testimony to your country's great struggle against colonialism and racism and to your personal record of distinguished service and leadership in this august body.

117. I was reluctant to address the Council again since we had spelt out our position at earlier meetings of the Council. As a matter of fact, the statement of the representative of Lebanon has dispelled the repeated attempts at distortion by the representative of Israel. I remained reluctant to address the Council again despite the deep hurt I am sure every Arab feels concerning the exercise by the United States of its veto power in the voting on a draft resolution in which the Lebanese delegation has sought to focus attention on a limited subject in a limited area—namely, the southern part of Lebanon and the Bekaa. As a matter of fact, much of the evidence regarding the practices of the Israeli occupation authorities in the south of Lebanon is drawn from documentation and reports that people in the United States Government, the United States Congress and the United States press and other media have confirmed. Therefore the hurt comes not so much from a super-Power exercising the right of veto.

118. The representative of the United Kingdom has mentioned other countries that have exercised the right of veto. The issue is not who exercises the right of veto more than others. The test is on what kind of issues the right of veto is exercised. It is in this respect that a wound has been inflicted on peoples throughout the Arab world today. Despite the fact that the Arab peoples and the Arab States had perhaps expected this veto, there is yet a level of innocence throughout the Arab world and among the Arab peoples: they hoped that perhaps at the last moment the United States might abstain. There is so much residual good will throughout Lebanon and the Arab world towards the people and the intellectual and political heritage of the United States that, despite pragmatic and realistic assessments, there was hope that, since many countries—of Western Europe particularly, whose relations with the United States are of paramount strategic, ideological and political importance—had sought to modify some of the legitimate imperatives in the draft resolution submitted by Lebanon and to confine it to the very elementary imperatives of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949[3] perhaps at the last moment a change of mind in tune with the value system the United States has always advocated would enable it, if not to join in the unanimity, at least to refrain from disrupting it. That is why, as we said earlier, there has been a breach of an intellectual contract between the United States and the Arab people.

119. Maybe in some of our most romantic moments we could say that tonight there was a breach in the spiritual bond between the United States Government and many, many millions of the Arab people. It is unfortunate, because several of us have been eager throughout that our differences and some of our divergences of opinion and policies with the United States should not culminate in a situation of either conflict or confrontation. And, in spite of the veto, we still entertain the possibility of a corrective process, because we consider the United States to be a persuadable constituency. However, at the moment we are sufficiently hurt and wounded that the option of anger cannot be totally ruled out.

120. It is the level of permissiveness this veto exercise confers that allows Israel to pursue its policies uninterrupted and the Israeli representative, without hesitation or forethought and in the typically mindless Israeli form, to deflect attention from the focus of Lebanon's complaint by attempting to verbalize and cover up the various violations Israel commits in the south of Lebanon through a technique which has the elements of filibuster, diversionary tactics and analogies that are not within the Council's purview or germane to the debate. Yet the Israeli technique is well known: it has been uncovered repeatedly and it has been isolated and pinpointed repeatedly.

121. What is more surprising and more hurtful is that some of the Israeli assumptions should be accepted and acquiesced in by the United States, which definitely knows better. For example, the United States knows that Lebanon's complaint to the Council which is under consideration today and since 1982 and the discussion of the practices in occupied southern Lebanon stem from Israel's invasion of Lebanon.

122. What is in fact mind-boggling is to reward the invasion of Lebanon, which has lasted for more than two years now, with the diplomatic shield that this veto has provided, thereby enabling Israel to project itself as almost a determining factor in Lebanon's internal development and the dynamics of its search for political stability and the exercise of its sovereignty. Whatever might have been the circumstances of the presence of Syrian forces in Lebanon, Israel cannot under any circumstance or condition equate its presence in southern Lebanon as a result of invasion with the presence by invitation of the Arab deterrent forces in the rest of Lebanon. To allow Israel even to recharge the batteries

of its techniques of deflection and give it more time to do so through the paralysis of the Security Council by the exercise of the veto is, again, mind-boggling.

123. We do not want to say that the reason for this course of action is to shield Israel's invasion of southern Lebanon. But to project the image that the United States feels the draft resolution is uneven is, more or less, like defining objectivity as an equidistant position between right and wrong and defining even-handedness as an equidistant position between violation and occupation and a genuine search for genuine peace.

124. Has it become a pattern that any time the international community judges a situation to be in violation of the 1949 Geneva Conventions, the Charter of the United Nations or any other of those principles and resolutions it is sufficient for Israel to make any kind of statement and that statement is factored in and, therefore, an even-handed position is defined by equalizing Israel with the international consensus? If the United States is brokering Israel's violation into some form of clothing it with the legitimacy of acceptability, that is mind-boggling.

125. We have felt throughout this debate—and with the rumours that developed into a reality to the effect that the United States would veto, not this particular draft resolution, but any draft resolution on southern Lebanon at this particular time—that this must be the momentum of continued brooding over a policy which has failed in Lebanon. We do not think that the United States has failed. We consider the abrogation of the Agreement of 17 May 1983 to be an opportunity for the United States to reassess—however painful it might be—its overall policy and see that aggression and the aggrieved cannot be placed on an equal footing under the pretext of objectivity and even-handedness.

126. We have suffered a wound today. Let us hope it is not—and I am sure it will not be—a mortal wound in our relations.

127. The PRESIDENT: The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6 p.m.

NOTES

[1] Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *The Hague Conventions and Declarations of 1899 and 1907* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1915).

[2] United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.75, Nos. 970-973.

[3] *Ibid.*, No. 973.

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الامم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع انحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب الى : الامم المتحدة ،قسم البيع في نيويورك او في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店查询或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61313—February 1993—2,050